Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

05-114 MAY 11 2005

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

In the

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

BEVERLY ANN HOLLIS-ARRINGTON

Petitioner,

Vs.

FANNIE MAE, CENDANT MORTGAGE CORPORATION, JUDGE CONSUELO B. MARSHALL, JUDGE STEVEN V. WILSON, JUDGE ANDREW KLEINFELD, JUDGE PAMELA D. REYMER, FIDELITY NATIONAL TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY, SUZANNE M. HANKINS, ET. AL.

Respondents

On petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit

---

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

BEVERLY ANN HOLLIS-ARRINGTON
22912 Hartland Street
West Hills, Ca 91307
(818)999-3561

May 10, 2005

Petitioner In Pro Se

Questions presented

1. Whether the Court of Appeals must follow the precedent set by this Honorable Court?

2. Whether the Court Of Appeals must follow its own precedents.

3. Given the Congressional intent of the established jurisdiction of the United States Appeals Courts, as a court of review to the orders of a lower Court, did the appeals Court act properly by rewriting the order of the lower court to reflect what they believe the judge should have said, then rule on their own changes?

4. When a United States Judges have usurped his authority, and ignored the jurisdiction of the Court, codified in article III of the United States Constitution; and thereby lifting their immunity, followed by allegations of conspiring with the defendants, to corruptly fix the out come of three prior cases filed by this petitioner, by way of bribery; can this petitioner use denial of access as a precursor to a Constitutional claim of due process violation, consistent with this Honorable Courts holding in "Christopher v Harbury"?

5. Can the Court ignore its own precedent, and DC Code Ann. § 13-423(a) (1) set in "Second Amendment Foundation v United States Conference of Mayors, et. al., and refuse to accept personal jurisdictions of all defendants, based on an alleged conspiracy, with one defendant residing in the forum state, and the remain defendants acting as the agents of that defendant?

6. Can the court depart from the holdings of all Circuits, including its own, and rewrite the doctrine of res judicata, as they did in this case?

PARTIES TO PROCEEDINGS

Beverly Ann Hollis-Arrington is the petitioner, in pro se in this matter.

Respondents are: Fannie Mae, Cendant Mortgage Corporation, Fidelity National Title Insurance Company, Judge Consuelo B. Marshall, Judge Steven V. Wilson, Judge Pamela Rymer, Judge Andrew Kleinfeld, Judge Browning, Suzanne M. Hankins, esq., Robert O. Matthews, Conny B. McCormack (in her official capacity as register recorder for the County of Los Angeles)

David W. Goewey
Venable LLP
575 Seventh Street N.W.
Washington D C 20004-1601

Attorneys for:

Fidelity National Title insurance
Robert O. Matthews

Weiner Brodsky Sidman Kider Pc
Attention: David M. Souders
1300 19th Street
Fifth Floor
Washington D. C. 20036-1609

Attorneys For: Fannie Mae, Cendant Mortgage Corp. And, Suzanne M. Hankins, Esq.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Questions Presented.....i

Parties to the Proceedings.....ii

Table of Contents.....iii

Table of Authorities.....iv

Opinions below.....1

Jurisdiction.....1

Relevant Statutory Provisions.....2

Statement of the case.....2

Reason Why the writ Should be Granted.....5

Conclusion.....8

Appendix

Appendix A- 02-11-04- United States Court of Appeal for the District Of Columbia Order Denying Rehearing En Banc.....1A

Appendix B – 11-15-04- United States Court Of Appeals for the District of Columbia Opinion.....3A

Appendix C- 02-17-04- Initial Order of the District Court.....6A

Appendix D-Filed material so that the court may better understand the case before it.....8A

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Judicial Authority

Best v Kelly 309 U.S. D.C. 51; 39 F. 3d 328.....3

Bieneman v City of Chicago, 864 F. 2d 463, 469 (7th Cir. 1988).....Passim

Bivens v Six Unknown Named Agents of federal Bureau of Narcotics 403 U.S. 388, 29 L Ed. 2d 619, 91 S. Ct. 1999 (1971).....passim

Conley v Gibson, 355 U.S. 41, 45-46, 2L Ed. 2d 80, 78 S Ct. 99 (1957).....passim

Davis v Passman, 422 U.S. 228, 60 L. Ed. 2d 846, 99 Ct. 2264 (1979).....passim

Maharaj v Bank of America Corp. 128 F3d. 94,97 (2d Cir. 1997)..4

Maher v Durango Metals Inc., 144 F. 3d 1302, 1304 (10th Cir. 1998).....passim

Melvin P. Deutsch v United States Department of Justice, ET. al., 881 F. Supp. 49; 1995 U.S. Dist. .....passim

Rivet, et al., v Regions Bank of Louisiana et al., 522 U.S. 470; 118 S. Ct. 921.....passim

Scheuer v Rhodes, 416 U.S. 232, 236, 40 L. Ed. 2d 90, 94 S Ct. 1683 (1974) *overruled on other grounds, Davis v Scherer* 468 U.S. 183, 82 L. Ed. 2d. 139, 104 S. Ct. 3012 (1984).....5

Second Amendment Foundation v United States Conference of Mayors, et al., 348 U.S. App. D.C. 238; 274 F. 3d 521; 2001 U.S. App.....5

Taxpayers Watchdog, Inc v. Stanley, 819 F.2.d 294, 297 (D.C. Cir. 1987).....1

Warren Christopher, Former Secretary of State, Et Al, v Jennifer K. Harbury 536 U.S. 403; 122 S. Ct. 2179; 153 L ed. 2d 413.....1

Petition for Writ of Certiorari

Petitioner Beverly Ann Hollis-Arrington respectfully petition for a writ of certiorari to review the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit in this case.

Opinion Below

The Appeals Court issued an unpublished order on initial review/ 11-15-04 and on petition for rehearing en banc.

Jurisdiction

The Jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1254(1)

Constitutional and Statutory Provisions Involved

Article III of the U.S. Constitution

Fourteenth amendment of the U.S. Constitution

Statement of the Case

This petition seeks review of a decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, rewriting the lower courts as "patently insubstantial" that it presents no federal questions suitable for disposition.

(a) Petitioner believes that the decision of the Court of Appeals is inconsistent with a controlling decision of this court in *Warren Christopher, Former Secretary of State, ET. Al. v. Jennifer K. Harbury.*

(b) Additionally, the congressional intent for the court of appeals is a court of review. The lower court's order dismisses the case based on res judicata, and lack of personal jurisdiction.

The appeals court states that the case is "Patently insubstantial" and that it presented no suitable question for deposition. Using *"Best v. Kelly, 39 F. 3d 328, 330 (D. C.) circuit,* as controlling law. There is no correlation between this case and the sighted case.

(c) Congress did not intend for the appeals court to rewrite a lower courts opinion, and then review its own findings.

(d) The lower court dismissed this case finding res judicata applied, even though petitioners claim for denial of access to the court did not accrue until the final case had been dismissed. There was never a claim for violations of my constitutionally protected right to due process, as a result of the denial of the petitioner's right of access to the court. However, on appeal, res judicata was not addressed in favor or rewriting the lower courts order, to a patently insubstantial, with no federal question present.

(e) The lower court sighted a lack of personal jurisdiction Personal jurisdiction to some defendants (assumingly the

judges), even though petitioner plead conspiracy to deprive her the right to due process, as well as depravation of due process. The appeals court did not address the issue of personal.

(f) Jurisdiction at all in favor of changing the ruling to no federal question presented. Totally ignoring D.C. Code Ann. § 13-423. Under the Districts long arm statute, a District court may exercise Personal Jurisdiction over a person, who acts directly or by agent, as to a claim for relief arising from the person's... transacting any business in the District of Columbia. The complaint alleges that the defendants acted as agents of Fannie Mae, who resides in the District of Columbia. The ruling is in conflict with the D.C. Circuits own precedents and the State code which governs the long arm statute.

Reason Why the Writ Should Be Granted

This petition should be granted for two principal reasons. First, the Court of appeals decision flatly conflicts with controlling Supreme Court, other circuits, Congressional intent, and their own precedents, and almost operates to negate the Congressional intent for which the appeals court was established. The conflict is that the Appeals court is suppose to review the orders of the lower court. If the Court has the ability to change the orders, then, summarily affirm their change, then, what happens to the petitioner's due process? Secondly this process in itself violates the constitutionally protected right to due process under the law.

THE ISSUES ARE OF EXCEPTIONAL IMPORTANCE TO EVERY ONE WHO COMES TO THE APPEALS COURTS

This is the first case to be adjudicated in any circuit in which Five United States Judges have intentionally acted outside their Constitutional authority of Federal Jurisdiction. Title three of the United States Constitution is clear, as to what matter can be heard in Federal Court. Jurisdiction was raised every step along the way to give each of the named judges a chance to return case number CV-02-6568 CBM, back to the court of proper jurisdiction. Each ignored federal jurisdiction, as granted in the United States Constitution, completely. This, I allege was done in aid of their co-conspirators. This makes this case one of first impression not only for the D.C. circuit but for all circuits. The three judge panel and the full Court chose to summarily dismiss this ugly matter at my constitutionally protected expense. This is a dangerous precedent to set, and